This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents will not correct images, please do not report the images to the Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,990		12/31/2001	Herbert M. Reynolds	1335.00008	4532
27305	7590	02/26/2004		EXAM	INER
		ARD ATTORNEY	RAEVIS, ROBERT R		
THE PINEH		FFICE CENTER, SUI AVENUE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		S, MI 48304-5151	2856		

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/035,990	REYNOLDS ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Robert R. Raevis	2856					
The MAILING DATE of this communic Period for Reply	ation appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of the period for reply specified above, the maximum status. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply within the s	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r nication. days, a reply within the statutory minimum of third tory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON II, by statute, cause the application to become AE	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	on <u>23 January 2004</u> .						
·— ·)☐ This action is non-final.						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-65</u> is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3,6-9,11-15,32,37,40-54,55</u> 7) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>4,5,10,16-31,33-36,38,39,55</u> 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	withdrawn from consideration. 7-65 is/are rejected. and 56 is/are objected to.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	0) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) 0 objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objecti							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the same of the							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority decrease.	ocuments have been received. ocuments have been received in A f the priority documents have been al Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage					
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or Paper No(s)/Mail Date	O-948) Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) 					

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 40-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to claim 40, lines 1-7 suggest a plurality of different design templates, yet lines 8-13 use the phrase "each design template" (italics added, line 11) suggestive that (somehow) the method claim is limited to include all of the alternatives on lines 8-13. Is this the case; or does "each design template" refer back to the different alternatives in an alternative manner? Should "each design template" read —the provided design template—? Presently, lines 3-7 suggest that one (Note the "one" (line 3)) template is provided, but lines 8-11 suggest that all (Note the "each design template" (italics added, line 10)) the templates are used in establishing occupant accommodation. Lines 3-7 are not consistent with lines 8-11.

Claims 1-3,6,7,8,11-14,15,32,37,51-54,57-59,60,62-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kaptur, Jr. et al.

Kaptur, Jr. teaches a design template is used to check a seat within a vehicle, the template being of average size (see col. 2, line 4), and inherently employing a posture (see Figure 1). The template includes a torso that includes a torso section 108 that includes a "hip joint" 88 corresponding to an anatomical landmark, and at least one cross-sectional section (between pivots 88 and 56) that cooperates with the torso section at the anatomical landmark, the cross-sectional section describing a body seat interface (note surface 68) at the anatomical landmark.

Application/Control Number: 10/035,990

Art Unit: 2856

As to claims 6,7, note col. 4, lines 56-57, 66-75.

As to claims 11-14, Kaptur's reference to "accommodation checking" (col. 1, line 10) and "seat locations" (col. 1, line 35) are inclusive of all known seat positions, including all the way back.

As to claim 15, 32,37,62-65, determination of whether a seat is "satisfactory" (col. 1, line 14) provides for a step in designing a seat, if not the seat itself.

Claims 9 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaptur et al in view of Ekern et al.

Comments that exist above similarly apply here.

As to claims 9 and 61, it would have been obvious to employ an occupant restraint system upon Kapur's template because Ekern teaches (p. 125, left column, first paragraph of the "INTRODUCTION") that "restraint positioning" is a factor in accurately locating seated occupants in a vehicle, suggestive of application of a restraint system in Kaptur to assure that the template if properly positioned.

Claims 4,5,10,16-31,33-36,38,39,55,56 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Application/Control Number: 10/035,990 Page 4

Art Unit: 2856

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert R. Raevis whose telephone number is 703-305-4919. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 6:30am to 4:00pm. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

RAEVIS